

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

The Office Action dated January 29, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-24 have been cancelled. New claims 25-48 have been added. No new matter has been added. Entry of the present amendment, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Drawings

The Office Action objects to the drawings for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)(4) because reference characters “121a” and “122a” have been used to designate “both the (branches) and the (connecting part bearing members).” Applicant has amended the drawings to be in a more preferred form, thus rendering this objection moot.

Specification

The specification is objected to for various reasons. Applicant has amended the specification to be in a more preferred form, thus rendering this objection moot.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has cancelled claims 1-24, thus rendering this rejection moot.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Granlind (Int’l Pub. No. WO 01/68444, “Granlind”). Claims 1-24 have been cancelled and thus, this rejection is rendered moot. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant addresses Granlind with respect to newly added claims 25-48.

Claim 25 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein the first and second piston-cylinder arrangements are hydraulically directly interconnected such that hydraulic oil is distributed, under an overpressure, between the first and second piston-cylinder arrangements in response to a rocking or rolling motion of the hull of the boat.” Granlind fails to teach or suggest such features. In

particular, nowhere does Granlind disclose that hydraulic oil is distributed, under an overpressure, between the first and second piston-cylinder arrangements *in response to a rocking or rolling motion of the hull of the boat*. At best, Granlind teaches that support 11a may consist of an arrangement of hydraulic piston-cylinder devices that are connected together hydraulically through the medium of a control unit that includes activating means. Even so, merely connecting two hydraulic piston-cylinder devices together hydraulically does not constitute directly interconnecting first and second hydraulic piston-cylinder arrangements *such that hydraulic oil is distributed, under an overpressure, between the first and second piston-cylinder arrangements in response to a rocking or rolling motion of the hull of the boat*. Further, Granlind also lacks any teaching or suggestion that the rocking or rolling motion emanates from a twisting motion of two branches of the U-shaped chassis. Accordingly, claim 25 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 26-48 are dependent on claim 25 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 25 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein. For example, claim 41 recites, *inter alia*, “the first end portion of each of the two branches includes a sleeve-shaped bearing member having a first length within a range of 10% to 40% of a second length of the connecting part and wherein the sleeve-shaped bearing member is configured to receive a first end of the connecting part.” Not only does Granlind fail to teach or suggest that the first end portion of each of the two branches includes a sleeve-shaped bearing member configured to receive a first end of a connecting part, Granlind also fails to teach or suggest that the length of the sleeve-shaped bearing member is within a range of 10% and 40% of a length of the connecting part. Granlind discloses that a spacer arm 31 should correspond to 30-80% of the total length of unit 11 and/or unit 22. However, spacer arm 31 does not constitute a sleeve-shaped bearing member that is configured to receive a connecting part. Accordingly, claim 41 is allowable for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 29, 2007

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/
Chunhsi Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 824-3000